DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 055 AC 004 726

By-Newman, Marjorie

A Study of the Relationship of Teacher and Student Values, Attitudes, and Perceptions of Students' Problems to Achievement among Adult Basic Education Students.

Florida State Univ., Tallahassee.

Pub Date Jun 69

Note-102p.; M.S.Thesis

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.20

Descriptors-*Academic Achievement, Achievement Tests, *Adult Basic Education, *Adult Students, Attitudes, Correlation, Education, Masters Theses, Perception, Questionnaires, Research, Socioeconomic Status, Student Problems, *Student Teacher Relationship, *Teachers, Values

Identifiers-Adult Basic Learning Examination, Attitude Problem Questionnaire

This study examined factors contributing to achievement among adult basic education students, with emphasis on the student-teacher relationship as determined by differences between the two groups in values, attitudes, and perceptions of student problems. Subjects were 120 students and 12 teachers in an adult basic education program in the Mississippi Delta region. Student achievement was measured by grade level scores on pretests and posttests using the Adult Basic Learning Examination; values, attitudes, and perceptions were assessed by the special Attitude-Problem Questionnaire. Findings included the following (1) although teachers were lower middle to middle class in values and attitudes and most students (87.5%) were of a lower class than the teachers, student responses did not conform to the stereotyped values and attitudes of the disadvantaged; (2) teachers were less alike in their assessment of students' problems than in their own attitudes and values; (3) no significant relationship could be found between the achievement of students and their similarity or dissimilarity to their teachers in the indicated areas. Limiting factors in the study were also noted. (author/ly)

ED030055

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF TEACHER AND STUDENT VALUES, ATTITUDES, AND PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENTS' PROBLEMS TO ACHIEVEMENT AMONG ADULT BASIC EDUCATION STUDENTS

By
MAJORIE NEWMAN

A Thesis submitted to the Department of
Adult Education in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science

Approved:

George F. Aker
Professor Directing Thesis

Irwin R. Jahns

Kent S. Miller

Phillip A. Fordyce
Dean, College of Education

June, 1969

AC 004 726

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The present study grew out of an interest in adult basic education generated by members of the Florida State University Department of Adult Education.

I am grateful to have had the opportunity to work in this important field and for the direction and assistance of Dr. George F. Aker, Head of the Department and Chairman of my graduate committee, who aided in the selection of a research subject and made the necessary data available.

I would like to express appreciation also to the other members of my committee, Dr. Irwin R. Jahns and Dr. Kent S. Miller, for their guidance and criticism throughout the course of the research project, and to Virginia Caveny of the Florida State University Computing Center, for her assistance in analyzing the data.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. ii

LIST OF TABLES. iii

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION. 1

Background of the Problem
Statement of the Problem
Need for the Study

II. RELEVANT RESEARCH AND LITERATURE. 11

Introduction
General Achievement
Teacher Characteristics
Studies Related to Values, Attitudes, and Other Characteristics: Class, Rural-Urban, and Racial Differences
Studies of Adult Basic and Vocational Education Participants
Teachers of the Disadvantaged

III. METHODOLOGY. 31

Population
The Testing Instrument
Student Achievement
Limitations of the Study

IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA. 38

Student Characteristics
Teacher Characteristics
Student Achievement
Scoring the Questionnaire
Testing of the Hypotheses

V. RECAPITULATION AND DISCUSSION 68

Summary
Discussion

APPENDIX. 77

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 92

VITA. 97

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Student Characteristics: Personal and Family. . . 42
2. Student Characteristics: Domestic and Economic. . 43
3. Student Characteristics: Educational. 44
4. Demographic Characteristics of Teachers 46
5. Student Grade Levels: Pretest and Prior Education 49
6. Student Achievement by Grade Range. 49
7. Student Grade Change. 50
8. Student Grade Change by Class 50
9. Part I Scores on Attitude-Problem Questionnaire: Students and Teachers. 54
10. Part II Scores on Attitude-Problem Questionnaire: Students and Teachers. 56
11. Class Grade Level Change Compared with Teacher Scores on Attitude-Problem Questionnaire: Part II. 56
12. Student Grouping on the Attitude-Problem Questionnaire 60
13. Student Grouping by Class on Attitude-Problem Questionnaire: Part I 62
14. Student Grouping by Class on Attitude-Problem Questionnaire: Part II. 63
15. Relationship of Student Values and Attitudes to Achievement. 67
16. Relationship of Students' Perceptions of Problems to Achievement 67

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of The Problem

Considerable attention has been given by social scientists and educators to the elementary and high school student and to factors contributing to his performance and achievement in the public schools. Far less empirical data is available on the adult who later in life re-enters an educational program. Such authors as Kidd,[1] Brunner,[2] Miller,[3] and Houle[4] have provided only some theories of adult continuing education participants. Johnstone[5] through his study of 1962, provided the most comprehensive picture of the educational experience of American adults and typical characteristics of such participants compiled up to that time. Just as often a woman as a man, the adult education participant, according to Johnstone, was typically under forty, had completed high school or more, worked full-time, most often in a white-collar occupation, and had an above-average income.

---

[1] J.R. Kidd, How Adults Learn (New York: Association Press, 1959).

[2] Edmund de S. Brunner, An Overview of Adult Education Research (Chicago: Adult Education Association of the U.S.A., 1959).

[3] Harry L. Miller, Teaching and Learning in Adult Education (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964).

[4] Cyril O. Houle, The Inquiring Mind (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1963).

[5] John W. C. Johnstone and Ramon J. Rivera, Volunteers for Learning (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1965), p. 8.

The years between the school desegregation decision of the United States Supreme Court of 1954 and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 brought into focus another type of adult in need of education, differing vastly from the one described by the authors named above and profiled by Johnstone. His background, economic level, and prior lack of education rendered ineffective former adult education practices.

The objective of the Economic Opportunity Act which was passed following the Civil Rights Act in 1964, was to "raise the level of education of such individuals with a view to making them less likely to become dependent on others, improving their ability to benefit from occupational training and otherwise increasing their opportunities for more productive and profitable employment, and making them better able to meet their adult responsibilities."[1]

---

[1] "Economic Opportunity Act", 78 U. S. Statutes 508, Title II, Part B, Sec. 212 (1964).

While, according to Killian, "the Economic Opportunity Act and the War on Poverty furnished the tools for attacking the cumulative effects of racism"[1] the field of education was ill-prepared for such an attack.

Subsequent analyses provided descriptions of the disadvantaged adult and guidelines for his education. Institutes and training programs for adult basic education teachers became numerous. These usually have emphasized the particular psychological as well as intellectual characteristics of potential students which differ from those of adolescents of the same socio-economic group and also from those of other adult learners. Special methods and techniques found most successful in early programs and materials found most appropriate also have been central aspects of teacher training. These materials have, for the most part, been related to the literacy skills of reading and writing, oral communication, mathematical concepts, citizenship, concepts of family and community living, and general pre-vocational training.

Although individual programs have been subject to evaluation in terms of their specific goals, achievement of long-range objectives as stated in the Economic Opportunity Act cannot yet be assessed.

---

[1] Lewis M. Killian, The Impossible Revolution? (New York: Random House, 1968), p. 85.

Statement of the Problem

Despite the fact that disadvantaged adults have entered education programs on a voluntary basis, presumably with fairly high motivation for achievement, and that materials and methods have been geared to their specific needs, many programs have been characterized by failure to persist on the part of some of the students who enroll or failure to show significant achievement in terms of the goals of the programs.

Some assumptions have been made regarding the causes of lack of achievement but little data is available to support definitive conclusions. Since programs for disadvantaged adults are designed and structured to meet what are considered to be the needs, interests, and expectations of potential students for literacy skills, mathematical concepts, citizenship, concepts of family and community living and vocational training, it is possible that the sources of student failure lie outside the curriculum content. Therefore, it was the purpose of this study to examine other variables for their possible relationship to achievement in adult basic education. The selected variables considered were differences in values and attitudes between teachers and students, and perceptions of student problems by teachers and the students themselves.

Specifically, the objectives of the study were to:

1. Compare values, attitudes, and perceptions of student problems in several areas of life of teachers and students in an adult basic education program.
2. Determine the relationship of similarities or differences between teachers and students to achievement on the part of students.

With these objectives as a basis for the study the following hypotheses were formulated:

1. Students in adult basic education programs do not differ from their teachers in such noncognitive variables as values, attitudes, and perceptions of students' problems.
2. If differences exist between the values, attitudes, and perceptions of students' problems on the part of the teacher and of the student himself, they have no direct relationship to achievement on the part of the student.

Need for the Study

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 provided the basis for developing programs to raise the educational level of disadvantaged individuals and led to the special training of teachers and the creation of new materials and methods for this purpose. As Bloom points out, however, "the researcher must not be misled into thinking that the stating and accepting of educational objectives by teachers means that these objectives are a determining force in their actual teaching."[1]

---

[1] Benjamin S. Bloom, "Testing Cognitive Ability and Achievement," Handbook of Research on Teaching, ed. by N.L. Gage (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963), p. 390.

Since the majority of teachers in programs for adults are engaged in teaching on this level only on a part-time basis, it is possible that many of the methods and experiences they provide for the children they teach during the major portion of their day are carried over into adult programs despite the special training provided them. The inference can be made, therefore, that the means of selecting and preparing teachers of the disadvantaged adult should perhaps be altered or expanded to make possible the involvement and effort necessary for carrying learned objectives into practice.

Flanders brings into consideration a second aspect of the teacher-student relationship that has implications for adult basic education in saying that "to change . . . methods of teaching involves emotional as well as intellectual problems."[1] Not only does the teacher need to apply a new set of principles in working with adults, it may be necessary for him to bridge emotionally the gap between his usually middle-class orientation and that of lower-class disadvantaged students in order to provide an atmosphere of acceptance for the students.

---

[1] Ned A. Flanders, "Some Relationships Among Teacher Influence, Pupil Attitudes, and Achievement," Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness, ed. by Bruce J. Biddle and William J. Ellena (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1964), p. 230.

Stern cites many studies of noncognitive variables in teaching in which the underlying assumption is that teacher attitudes are significant for student learning, pointing out, however, that direct evidence of this is meager.[1] Other researchers have provided descriptions of adult learners in general, and the adult poor specifically, that are helpful in guiding the teacher and administrator of adult basic education programs but which create the danger of stereotyping and making false assumptions about student values, attitudes, and problems. It was for the purpose of providing empirical evidence about these variables in the context of an adult basic education program that the present study was undertaken.

Generalizations About Adult Learning and the Disadvantaged

Fay describes as general characteristics that affect adult learning in all groups: goal-orientation that is usually rooted in the not-too-distant future, conformity and inhibition to assimilated values and standards, specialized interests and activities, anxiety, and a self-concept that tends to underestimate the individual's ability.[2]

---

[1] George G. Stern, "Measuring Noncognitive Variables in Research on Teaching," in N.L. Gage (ed.), op.cit., p. 424.

[2] Jean B. Fay, "Psychological Characteristics Affecting Adult Learning," Basic Education for the Disadvantaged Adult: Theory and Practice, ed. by Frank W. Lanning and Wesley A. Many (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966), pp. 87-90.

The adult illiterate is characterized by additional traits that make learning for him more difficult. Derbyshire[1] lists these as insecurity, reticence, a feeling of resignation, extreme sensitivity to non-verbal cues of those in power, concrete rather than abstract thinking, and a tendency toward physical aggression as a defense.

Hendrickson adds to these the following characteristics of the illiterate adult that affect his ability to learn:

1. He is on the average lower in scholastic aptitude than peers who stayed in school.
2. He is easily discouraged and will be tempted to replicate his former drop out pattern of response.
3. His home conditions, more likely than not, will be non-conducive to study and homework.
4. He is doubtful of his ability to learn.
5. His social values and goals differ widely from the upper and middle-class values of his teachers and other school personnel.
6. He is likely to have more physical handicaps than peers who continued in school, such as poor vision or hearing, speech defects, etc.[2]

---

[1] Robert L. Derbyshire, "Poverty as Viewed by the Sociologist," in Frontiers in Adult Basic Education (Tallahassee: Dept. of Adult Education, Florida State University, 1966), pp. 18-23.

[2] Andrew Hendrickson, "How Adults Learn," Workshop in Adult Basic Education (Columbus: Ohio State University, College of Education, Center for Adult Education, July 1967), pp. 32-38.

Fessler makes several relevant distinctions between the world of the poor subordinate culture and that of the dominant middle-class.[1] He points out that for the former group, the family and peer or reference groups are included in their world but all other groups such as the school, church, job, and the government are looked upon as being part of the outer world for which they feel antagonism. Reference groups among the poor remain relatively unchanged during the lives of these people and membership in such groups is person-oriented rather than goal-oriented. Over-dependence of individuals upon their relationships to the group makes it difficult for them to develop a self image as something apart from the group. Momentary satisfactions, or "kicks", on which they thrive make routine activities such as going to school or holding down a job almost unbearable.

These generalizations about the disadvantaged adult have been formulated as well in the "Open and Closed Mind" hypothesis of Rokeach and in Frumkin's[2] theory that the lower-class individual accepts or rejects the status quo on the basis of dogma he agrees with or disagrees with, rarely in terms of scientific method or critical thinking. Black's appraisal of the culturally disadvantaged as "inflexible, not open to reason about morality, diet, their family polarity, and educational practices,"[1] further contributes to the image of the adult basic education student of the lower socio-economic class as alienated in values, attitudes, and perceptions of his problems from his middle-class teachers.

---

[1] Donald R. Fessler, "The Challenge: Motivating the Poor" (unpublished talk delivered November 6, 1965, revised December, 1965), 11 pp.

[2] Cited by S.E. Hand and William H. Puder, "Personality Factors Which May Interfere with the Learning of ABE Students" (Florida State University, unpublished manuscript), pp. 5-7 and 9-11.

The effects of this cultural chasm, if it, in fact, exists, on student achievement have not been sufficiently appraised through empirical study. The need to examine noncognitive variables in the teacher-student relationship and relate them to the adult basic education program is therefore apparent.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 12

CHAPTER II

RELEVANT RESEARCH AND LITERATURE

Introduction

It has been pointed out in Chapter I that little empirical data is available on factors contributing to achievement among adult basic education students. A good deal has been written, however, on characteristics of the disadvantaged, on the training and preparation of teachers, and on the effects of teachers on the learning process. This chapter will review some of the literature and research pertaining to the areas of achievement, teacher characteristics, selection and preparation, and the disadvantaged, particularly the Negro disadvantaged, for their implications in terms of the present study.

General Achievement

The need for achievement was considered by McClelland[1] and others to be a universal and relatively strong motive resulting in the tendency for individuals to approach or seek success and to avoid failure.

---

[1] D.C. McClelland, J.W. Atkinson, R.A. Clark, and E.L. Lowell, The Achievement Motive (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953), p. 78.

Atkinson and Feather[1] elaborate upon the theory of achievement motivation, attributing the strength of a tendency to undertake an activity to the belief or expectation that the activity will produce a consequence of value to the individual. They point out, as does McClelland, that achievement-oriented activity is always influenced by the conflict of two opposed tendencies, the tendency to achieve success and the tendency to avoid failure. Therefore, any achievement-oriented activity represents a resolution of the conflict between these two opposed tendencies. This may be the result of extrinsic sources of motivation to undertake an activity even when the resultant achievement-oriented tendency is negative. The expectancy of success, then, is seen as a manipulable motivational variable.[2] The achievement of success results in an increase in level of aspiration, while the change in strength of achievement-oriented tendencies following failure is a decrease in the level of aspiration.[3]

Heckhausen, on the basis of his research in personality psychology[4] concluded that an achievement-related experience often encompasses several levels of reality which may be defined in terms of stages that exist between the actual and the imagined, desired, or feared. Future time perspective includes levels which extend from the possible to the absolutely impossible, from certain to the uncertain. He, too, links goal settings to approach-avoidance conflicts, pointing out that changes of activation in one direction or the other are aroused by feedback about the progress of an activity. Failure-oriented persons may experience the absence of feedback as so threatening, he states, that they leave the field of endeavor.[1]

---

[1] John W. Atkinson and Norman T. Feather, A Theory of Achievement Motivation (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966), p 328 ff.

[2] Ibid., p. 330.

[3] Ibid., p. 337.

[4] Heinz Heckhausen, The Anatomy of Achievement Motivation (New York: Academic Press, 1967), p. 45.

Kemper[2] feels that achievement must be seen as an end point of a process beginning in ordinary socialization and role-learning and proceeding through several stages of increasing complexity in role performance. Reference groups, collectivities or persons who are taken into account in selecting behavior from among alternatives, are the social mechanisms by which individual achievement is ultimately fostered. These operate on three levels: 1.) the normative group sets norms and espouses values to which conformity is demanded, 2.) the comparison group serves as a role model, and 3.) the audience group provides the anticipation of rewards for outstanding performance in roles. One or two of the reference group types required for achievement may be missing. When the audience is absent there is no inducement to achieve at more than adequate levels. When the role model is absent much trial and error may be necessary to find the right formula for achievements. The more complex the task, the more need there is for a concrete model to motivate achievement. Role conflict may result when the normative group is separate from the audience since norms and rewards may be supplied by opposing sources.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 111.

[2] Theodore D. Kemper, "Reference Groups, Attitude and Achievement," *The American Sociological Review*, Vol.33 (February, 1968), pp. 31-45.

Khan[1] in his research of 1966, found that only about one-quarter to one-half of the variance in academic achievement was explained or accounted for by cognitive variables, but that the role of attitudinal factors in determining success or failure had not been extensively explored. He conducted a study to obtain, among other objectives, independent dimensions of attitudinal variables among over one thousand eighth-grade students, and to investigate the predictiveness of these presumably attitudinal factors, singly and in combination with each other and with cognitive measures, for secondary school achievement as indicated by standardized achievement tests. The conclusions of his research were that relationships between some attitudinal variables and academic achievement could be demonstrated and that scores on these variables remain efficient predictors of achievement criteria obtained later in time.

---

[1] S. B. Khan, "The Contribution of Attitudinal Factors to the Prediction of Academic Achievement in Secondary School" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1966), p. 130.

Kahl,[1] who studied achievement orientation, measured four components of such orientation in relation to socio-economic class. He points out that, according to his research, driving ambition is most characteristic of the lower-middle section of the status hierarchy, comprised of people with little education and some occupational success. Those with more education tend to strive less openly and vigorously, while the lower-class is more concrete in its aspirations and tends to avoid risk-taking, striving hard for limited goals.

Scanzoni, however, feels that achievement values do not necessarily vary with social status but that the higher the status, the stronger the commitment to occupational success goals.[2] For the lower-middle class, oriented toward lower-middle class goals, occupational achievement and mobility are less often defined as realistic.

---

[1] Joseph A. Kahl, "Some Measurements of Achievement Orientation," The American Journal of Sociology, Vol.70 (May, 1965), p. 669.

[2] John Scanzoni, "Socialization, n Achievement, and Achievement Values," The American Sociological Review, Vol. 32 (June, 1967), pp. 449-456.

Based on a five-per-cent sample of public schools in 1966, Mayeske[1] concluded that student attitudes and peer influence are highly related to academic achievement. A third factor he found significant was that of teacher attributes. These, as considered by other researchers, will be surveyed in the following section.

Teacher Characteristics

Rosenfeld and Zander[2] state that legitimate power stems from the perception that an influencer is behaving in accordance with the values of the person being influenced. In some instances, acts by a teacher may be perceived as legitimate or non-legitimate without there being direct attempts to influence the student.

Sears and Sherman[3] found, in their study of the effects of teaching styles on children, that the school environmental conditions which influenced the fifth and sixth grade students studied in depth over a period of two years was, first and foremost, the personalities of their teachers who, all working toward the same basic goals, operated in different ways in terms of behavior and purposes.

---

[1] U. S. Office of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics, Division of Operations Analysis, "Educational Achievement Among Mexican-Americans: A Special Report from the Educationsl Opportunities Survey," Report No. NCES-TN-22, by George W. Mayeske (Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, 1967).

[2] Howard Rosenfeld and Alvin Zander, "Dimensions of Teacher Attitudes," The Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 52 (February, 1961), p. 6.

[3] Pauline S. Sears and Vivian S. Sherman, In Pursuit of Self-Esteem (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1964).

Ryans[1] in the report on his study of characteristics of teachers, points out that teacher behavior is social behavior and that, therefore, the relation between teacher behavior and pupil behavior may be of a reciprocal nature. Teacher behavior also is a product of social conditioning and takes place relative to the cultural setting in which the teaching is carried on. Although his study was comprehensive in both its scope and the kinds of characteristics studied, only a few of its findings relevant to the present consideration are included here. Of particular significance is the work done on attitudes of teachers, and other personnel. Generally, the attitudes of elementary school teachers toward pupils and other personnel were markedly more favorable than were similar attitudes of secondary teachers. Neither amount of teaching experience nor age appeared to be very highly associated with teacher attitudes, although there was a slight tendency for attitudes of secondary teachers of greater experience to be more favorable toward administrators and less favorable toward pupils. However, contrary to other studies cited, Ryans reported that actual pupil behavior in the classroom, based upon observers' assessments, did not appear to be related to the attitudes held by teachers.[1] Generally, the lowest scores relative to understanding, friendly classroom behavior, stimulating, imaginative classroom behavior, favorable attitudes toward democratic classroom practices, verbal understanding, and emotional stability, and the most traditional learning-centered educational viewpoints scores were attained by teachers in communities judged to be about average in socio-economic level. Both low socio-economic and high socio-economic level communities had teachers with higher scores on these characteristics and with more permissive educational viewpoints.

---

[1] David G. Ryans, Characteristics of Teachers (Washington, D.C.: The American Council on Education, 1960), p. 16.

Studies Related to Values, Attitudes, and Other Characteristics: Class, Rural-Urban, and Racial Differences

Glenn[2] presents the opinion that, contrary to the viewpoint that urban-industrial societies undergo a general process of homogenation of values, beliefs, and life styles,

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 385.

[2] Norval D. Glenn "The Trend in Differences in Attitudes and Behavior by Educational Level," *The Sociology of Education*, Vol. 39 (Summer, 1966), pp. 255-275.

the highly educated and poorly educated people of the United States have diverged in several kinds of attitudes and behaviors. Having studied social stratification in this country from 1949 to 1960, he found this to be as important a basis for cultural and behavioral differences now as it was decades ago. In turn, the most important basis for economic and cultural differentiation of the lower and upper segments of society is education.

Glenn and Alston[1] analyzed responses to the opinion polls of Gallup and the National Opinion Research Center from 1953 to 1965 to determine whether the stereotypes and impressions of social scientists regarding rural-urban differences in reported attitudes and behaviors could be validated. Their study considered farmers, adult members of farmer's households, upper and lower manual and non-manual workers. Although some needed qualification, generally the stereotypes were upheld: farmers were found to be more traditional in religious beliefs, more work-oriented, isolationist, and unlikely to read books or newspapers. In these characteristics they were found to be more similar to manual workers than to non-manual or white collar workers. Another stereotype upheld was that of authoritarianism being positively associated with age and southern residence and negatively associated with education.

---

[1] Norval D. Glenn and Jon P. Alston, "Rural-Urban Differences in Reported Attitude and Behavior," Southwestern Social Science Quarterly, Vol. 47 (March 1967), pp. 381-400.

One can assume that Glenn and Alston refer here to southern residence by whites, although this is not specifically stated. Brazziel[1] provides some descriptive data on southern Negro personality through a study of differences in need structure of Negro and white college students. In general, upper-south Negroes were found to be motivated by a need structure more similar to whites as determined by the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. They demonstrated low needs for achievement. Lower-south Negro students, however, were found to be characterized by conflicting needs; they had a low need for endurance, were orderly, submissive, intraceptive, deferent, and persistent. Females of this group were more ambitious, persistent and intraceptive than males, conforming with the stereotype of female dominance among low middle-income Negroes.

Grindstaff[2] provides an analysis of data obtained from the 1960 Census on characteristics of the population for Mississippi, South Carolina, Alabama, and Georgia, which indicates that as the Negro becomes more urban in the deep south he becomes less equal in relative terms to the white population in indices of education, occupation and, for the most part, income.

---

[1] William F. Brazziel, "Correlates of Southern Negro Personality," The Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 20 (April, 1964), pp. 46-53.

[2] Carl F. Grindstaff, "The Negro, Urbanization and Relative Deprivation in the Deep South," Social Problems, Vol. 15 (Winter, 1968), pp. 342-352.

Bradford,[1] in a study concerned with the process by which Negro youth learn Protestant Ethic values, found that lower class youths believed work to be important, that one should work hard, and that through hard work a person is able to advance occupationally. The strength of these values was found to be determined by family conditions, the prestige of the youths' fathers' jobs, unemployment records of the fathers, and family size. However, in youths having strong acceptance of the Protestant Ethic, these tended to be modified by their later work experience. It is not known whether the students studied came from rural or urban backgrounds.

Katz[2] after surveying research data available, pointed out that Negro children hold achievement values and standards that are not translated into actual achievement efforts. This, he attributed to their internalized mechanisms of affect-mediating self-evaluation.

---

[1] David Lee Bradford, "The Formation of Achievement Attitudes Among Lower-Class Negro Youth" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1966).

[2] Irwin Katz, "The Socialization of Academic Motivation in Minority Group Children," Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, Vol. 15, ed. by David Levine (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1967), pp. 67-103.

This view is strengthened by Irelan and Besner[1] who state that "they (the poor) are convinced of their own impotence so that, while they accept typical American values they are frequently lethargic in trying to attain them."

Coles[2] supports this view in pointing out that the poor lack money and work but they have an attitude of humor and distrust of hypocrisy and dishonest morality and therefore don't want to be middle-class. It is not surprising then, that evidence has been found by Katz[3] and others that Negro and lower-class children perceive white middle-class teachers as rejectant. However, there are probably as many conclusions by social scientists that a contradictory attitude prevails as represented by Lewis' statement that "there is awareness of middle-class values . . . people (the poor) talk about them and even claim some of them as their own."[4]

---

[1] Lola M. Irelan and Arthur Besner, "Low-Income Outlook on life," in U. S. Welfare Administration, Low-Income Life Styles, No. 14, ed. by Lola M. Irelan (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office [1966]).

[2] Robert Coles, The Poor Don't Want to be Middle-Class (New York: Curriculum Consultation Service, 103 E. 125th St., 1965).

[3] Irwin Katz, "Some Motivational Determinants of Racial Differences in Intellectual Achievement," International Journal of Psychology, Vol. 2 (1967), pp. 1-12.

[4] Oscar Lewis, "The Culture of Poverty," Scientific American, Vol. 215 (October, 1966), p. 23.

Studies of Adult Basic and Vocation Education Participants

Scharles,[1] in his study of the relationship of personality needs to participation, drop out, and achievement among adult learners in the Hillsborough County, Florida Adult Evening High School, found that of the males, the high achiever group differed from the low achiever group in that the high achiever showed a higher psychological need strength in exhibition and succorance and a lower psychological need strength in achievement, deference, intraception, dominance, and heterosexuality. Females differed in that the high achiever group showed a higher psychological need strength in abasement than did the females in the low achiever group.

Dutton[2] also studied adult basic education participants in Hillsborough County, Florida in order to identify the association of certain personal characteristics with participation in a stipend versus a non-stipend educational program and the attitudinal variable of alienation. The stipend students were predominantly female, less than forty years old, separated or divorced, and had a family income of less than $1000 a year. The non-stipend students were about equally divided between male and female, also likely to be under forty, but they were more likely to be married and had family incomes of from $1000 a year to $5000 or more. Stipend students were unemployed at the time while the non-stipend students held jobs. For both groups, money was a major problem and the thing liked most about the class was the teacher.[1] A significant difference was found between the stipend students and those who participated on a non-stipend basis in characteristics related to social relationships, leisure time and relation to the community. This, it was suggested, points up that the undereducated are not all alike as most studies indicate.[2] Race and family income were found to be significantly associated with the degree of alienation of the students, those that were more highly alienated, Negro students, being more suspicious of middle-class people and their motives for trying to initiate change.[3] A final significant finding of this study was the lack of any one source to which the adult basic education students turned for solution to their problems, suggesting to the author that several programs or approaches may be necessary in educating these people.

---

[1] Henry G. Scharles, Jr., "The Relationship of Selected Personality Needs to Participation, Drop Out, and Achievement Among Adult Learners" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1966).

[2] Marion D. Dutton, "A Description and Analysis of Selected Characteristics of Participants in Adult Basic Education in Hillsborough County, Florida" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1967).

---

[1] Ibid., p. 122-124.

[2] Ibid., p. 130.

[3] Ibid.

Students in adult basic education programs conducted in Mississippi in 1966[1] answered in the majority that they had no problems while thirty-two percent perceived the existence of one or more problems in relation to their participation in the school programs and only ten percent perceived problems related to the home. For teachers, finding appropriate materials and helping students with personal problems were of equal importance among their largest problems, individualizing instruction last. Teacher aides, who were more like the students in their backgrounds and education levels, felt that making application of subject matter to the lives of students was their second most important problem, helping students with personal problems ranked third, and individualizing instruction fourth. The teachers felt that making application of subject matter to the lives of students was among their smallest problems. Both teachers and teacher aides generally considered pacing instruction for fast and slow learners their greatest problem, and both groups ranked family and community living, occupational education, and citizenship education as lowest areas in terms of program emphasis while math, language, and reading ranked most important.[1]

---

[1] George F. Aker, Irwin R. Jahns, and Wayne L. Schroeder, "Evaluation of an Adult Basic Education Program in a Southern Rural Community" (Tallahassee: Department of Adult Education, Florida State University, 1968).

Such divergence in evidence and opinion indicates the need for more systematic study of the variables contributing to such attitudes, behaviors, and life styles. This is of particular importance for teachers of the disadvantaged, whether urban or rural, children or adults.

Teachers of the Disadvantaged

It does not appear sufficient to list qualities teachers of the disadvantaged need, such as patience, versatility, humor, optimism, understanding, perception,[2] etc., which seems to have been the prevailing pattern. Although Reissman[3] describes what the training of teachers of the disadvantaged should accomplish in more specific terms, we do not know whether his formula or those of others actually produce successful teachers. Reissman states that a genuine interest in and respect for the students must be developed along with the perception of the culture of the disadvantaged as different rather than negative. This, he tells us, can be accomplished through careful exposure of the prospective teacher to the disadvantaged to remove negative preconceptions about them. The teacher in training should read novels, see films, art, dance, and hear music produced by members of the sub-culture; family organization, child rearing, division of functions and responsibilities should be observed in order to change negative attitudes. Training also should show the teacher how teaching methods can be adapted to the learning style of the disadvantaged.[1]

---

[1] *Ibid*., pp. 33-35.

[2] The National Association for Public School Adult Education, *A Guide for Teacher Trainers in Adult Basic Education* (Washington, D. C.: By the Association, 1966).

[3] Frank Reissman, "Lessons of Poverty," *American Education* (U. S. Office of Education) Vol. 1 (February, 1965), pp. 21-23.

Hanna found that on-site courses in methods and theories of teaching the culturally handicapped on the secondary level, along with the development of new materials to fit the group to be reached, had resulted in feedback indicating a high degree of understanding of the culture of poverty had been achieved in the teachers. Again, no data were collected to support this.[2]

A study by Howard[3] of the relationship between the needs and problems of socially disadvantaged urban children as perceived by the children and by public school personnel, that is, the degree of understanding of the needs and problems of the children by their teachers, suggests that specialized teacher training methods and special materials not based upon empirical research findings result in many discrepancies between the two. As with the rural Coahoma County group, these urban children felt that school related problems were greater, whereas the teachers tended to overestimate the number of problems related to students' home environments and family relationships.

---

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 94.

[2] Lyle Hanna, "Teacher Education for Advancing the Culturally Handicapped " (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, California State College, 1967).

[3] Douglas Pierre Howard, "The Relationship Between the Needs and Problems of Socially Disadvantaged Urban Children as Perceived by the Children and by Public School Personnel " (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Syracuse University, 1966).

It is apparent that careful selection of teachers for the disadvantaged is necessary although often difficult. Ryans[1] reports the attempt to correlate characteristics of teachers-to-be and future classroom performance and found success in applying predictors to large groups but not to individuals.

Skeel[2] made a similar study among elementary teachers to determine whether they had the proper attitudes to be effective teachers of the culturally deprived. The Cultural Attitude Inventory was found to be a reliable instrument for selecting effective teachers for culturally deprived schools prior to the student teaching experience.

---

[1] David G. Ryans, "Research on Teacher Behavior in the Context of the Teacher Characteristics Study," Biddle and Ellena (eds.), op.cit., pp. 67-101.

[2] Dorothy June Skeel, "Determining the Compatibility of Student Teachers for Culturally Deprived Schools by Means of a Cultural Attitude Inventory" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1966).

Pearce[1] reports on a study designed to provide factual evidence about teachers in adult basic education at Modesto Junior College's New Hope Adult Retraining Center. Data were gathered from trainees, instructors, and administrators, resulting in the following conclusions:

The ideal teacher of adult basic education students should be people-oriented, more interested in individuality than conformity, and more interested in finding solutions than in following rules. His foremost concern must be to help the student gain self-confidence and hope. Understanding, in terms of active involvement in the student's problems, rather than a sense of sympathy was considered to be of critical importance. It was found that the conditions under which the teacher has lived may be much more important than prior educational experience, for exposure to conditions similar to those in which the students lived produced teachers who accepted students as they were and were, in turn, accepted by the students. Pearce concludes that there is very little difference between the characteristics needed by the adult basic education teacher and the effective teacher in any other setting. On the other hand, he points out, these characteristics must be present in the basic education setting, while teachers in other programs may not possess such qualities and the programs still manage to survive.

---

[1] Frank Pearce, "Basic Education Teachers: Seven Needed Qualities," Adult Leadership, Vol. 16 (January, 1968), pp. 255-258, 278.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Population

The population for the study was a group of adult basic education students participating in a community action program funded by the United States Office of Economic Opportunity in the Mississippi Delta. The two hundred students were primarily Negro seasonal farm workers who, residing in a state in which segregation has been the cornerstone,[1] it was felt would be most likely to display the characteristics of the disadvantaged adult. The availability of this group for testing and their willingness to take part were contributing factors in their selection.

The Testing Instrument

A survey of various scales and instruments designed for measuring attitudes, values, and perceptions revealed no test appropriate for the purpose of this study. The Allport-Vernon scale for measuring values[1] was considered beyond the level of comprehension of students in this program, as well as being too complex in its method of response. The SRA Junior Inventory[2] intended to discern the needs and problems of children in grades four through eight was, in some respects, applicable but contained many items irrelevant to the population being studied.

---

[1] James W. Silver, Mississippi: The Closed Society (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1964), p. 90.

The scales devised by Thurstone[3] for measuring attitudes and values, as well as those of Guilford[4] and Likert[5] measure these variables against a norm which was not the purpose of this study. The Mooney Problem Check List,[6] intended for junior and senior high school and college students also appeared inappropriate, as was the Allen Modified Scale of Beliefs[1] directed toward high school students' values in terms of American and democratic concepts only.

---

[1] Gordon W. Allport, Philip E. Vernon, and Gardner Lindzey, Study of Values: A Scale for Measuring the Dominant Interest in Personality (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1960).

[2] Howard, op. cit., pp. 115-121.

[3] L.L. Thurstone, The Measurement of Values (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1959).

[4] Benjamin J. Allen, Jr., "The Construction of an Instrument Designed to Measure Student Held Attitudes Toward Certain American Values as Related to a Jury of Experts Consensus" (unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1965), p. 13 describing technique used in J.P. Guilford, "Racial Preferences of 1000 American University Students," Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 2 (1931), pp. 179-204.

[5] Ibid., p. 14.

[6] H.H. Remmers, Introduction to Opinion and Attitude Measurement (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954), p. 189.

Since the objective of this study was a comparison of student and teacher values, attitudes, and perceptions of student problems rather than a comparison of either of these groups to an accepted norm, a special instrument was needed incorporating particular aspects of the sociological and psychological environment of the disadvantaged adult in the geographic area being studied and the currently generalized concepts of his problems.

Design of the Instrument

A testing instrument was developed through a series of procedures involving experts in the fields of education and sociology, and several pre-test groups of disadvantaged adults.

Initially, a list of ninety statements related to values and attitudes and forty-eight statements describing problems were formulated on the basis of the literature and research related to disadvantaged adults. These statements were intended to measure values, attitudes, and problems in the areas of education, jobs, home and family life, relationships to society, self concepts, and self determination. They were first evaluated by the following experts:

---

[1] Allen, Jr., op. cit., pp. 109-115.

1. A family service worker in a federally funded project for the disadvantaged in Tallahassee, Florida
2. A professor of Sociology at Florida State University
3. Two professors of Adult Education at Florida State University
4. A professor of Sociology at Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University
5. A director of field services for the Florida Education Association
6. A consultant in education for migrant children in the Florida State Department of Education
7. A former teacher of elementary school children in a lower socio-economic area of Atlanta, Georgia
8. An assistant director of a program for fathers in a federally funded project for the disadvantaged in Tallahassee, Florida

On the basis of their evaluation, the list of statements about values and attitudes was reduced to thirty-six items and the statements of problems were reduced to thirty in number. These were then pretested in the form of a two-part questionnaire.

Although all items listed were identical for both students and teachers, instructions for responding differed for the two groups. The students were asked to indicate their agreement or disagreement with each statement in the first part of the questionnaire, related to values and attitudes, and in the second part to indicate the extent to which each statement represented a problem for them. Teachers also were asked to agree or disagree with each statement in Part I of the questionnaire. In Part II, however, they were asked to indicate the extent to which they felt the statements represented problems for adult basic education students generally. The answer choices in Part II were "Big problem", "Little problem", "No problem".

In this form the questionnaire was administered to:

1. Members of an adult literacy class at Lively Technical and Vocational School in Tallahassee, Florida
2. Members of an adult basic education class conducted by the Dade Street Center in Tallahassee, Florida
3. Individual adults in the Negro community of Tallahassee, Florida known as "Frenchtown"
4. Individual adults obtaining food at the Commodity Warehouse operated by United Charities of Tallahassee
5. Adult basic education teachers at Lively Technical and Vocational School, the Dade Street Center, the Human Resources Clearing House, and the First Presbyterian Church of Tallahassee

The comments and reactions derived from this pretest led to the elimination of items that were ambiguous or misunderstood and resulted in revision of the instrument to its present form. In this form, accompanied by instructions for both teachers and students and personal data questionnaires for each group, the Attitude-Problem Questionnaire was administered to the Mississippi sample group described (see Appendix).

Student Achievement

In addition to attitudes, values, and perception of problems, it was necessary, to test the hypotheses formulated, to gather data on achievement of students who took part in the ABE program. This was done on the basis of grade level scores on the Adult Basic Learning Examination (ABLE) administered at the beginning and conclusion of the education program.

Limitations of the Study

The present study was conducted among adult basic education students taking part in a community action program funded by the United States Office of Economic Opportunity in the Mississippi Delta. The participants formed a relatively homogeneous group comprised of rural seasonal workers who were employed in low socio-economic level occupations and who were functioning at about third grade literacy level.

It was necessary to develop a testing instrument suitable for the particular population and to the variables being studied. While it was felt that the findings of this study might be generalized to adult basic education programs similarly constituted, the results may not be applicable to students and teachers in an urban environment or with less homogeneous socio-economic characteristics.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Thirteen adult basic education classes took part in the testing program. Grade level change measured for students in these classes, based on tests given before a seven month period of instruction in an adult basic education program and after it, was used as an indication of student achievement.

The Attitude-Problem Questionnaire, developed for this study, was administered to all students who were participating in the program five months after its beginning. However, only those students for whom grade level test scores, obtained at the beginning and conclusion of the seven month period of instruction, were available were included in the final sample. This brought the number of students to 120, participating in twelve classes ranging in size from five to fifteen members. Three of the classes had changes in teachers approximately three months after the program began. It was decided that these groups would be included in the analysis of the data collected to determine whether they showed any significant difference from the other classes. The twelve teachers in the final sample who responded to the questionnaire were those teaching classes at the time of the final grade level test.

Student Characteristics

With the exception of one item related to personal data, student characteristics were obtained for enough of the total sample population to generally describe the participants. This item was related to the type of work of the respondent. Since sixty-two of the adult students indicated that they were unemployed at the time, lack of response on the item was to be expected.

Of the 120 students in the final sample, 111 gave their age. The group ranged from 21 to 68 years; 8.1% were below 30 years of age, 37.8% were 40 years old or younger, and 92.7% were 50 or younger. A greater number of student participants were between 41 and 50 than in any other decade of life, with the mean age falling at 41.7.

Sixty-eight of the 120 students, or 56.7% were female, and fifty-two, or 43.3% were male. The greatest proportion were unmarried, 64.9%. Among them 4.3% were divorced, 25.6% were separated, 16.2% widowed, and 18.8% single; 35.4% of the students were married. Three students did not respond to this question.

Only a small number of the participants lived in urban areas, 4.2%. The greatest number lived on rural farms, 63.9%, and a smaller number listed their residences as rural non-farm, 31.9%.

Slightly over half the student population, 51.7%, was unemployed at the time of participation in the adult basic education program; 48.3% were employed part-time and only 5% reported having full-time employment.

The number of respondents who listed an occupation exceeded the number employed part or full-time, indicating that although they were not working at the time some of the ABE students did consider themselves as belonging in an occupational group. Of the sixty-six students who replied to this question, the greatest proportion listed farming as their occupations, 74.2%; 10.6% were domestics, 6.1% were manual laborers, and 9.1% were in service or other occupations.

Incomes for the group all fell below $3000 a year, with only 8.8% earning $1000 to $3000, 27.4% earning between $500 and $1000 a year, and 63.7% below $500 annually.

The number of dependents for the 110 students who responded to this questionnaire item ranged from one to fourteen, 50% having more than four dependents, and the mean number being 5.5.

The number of years of school previously completed by the adult education students ranged from one to nine. Only 3.4% had completed the eighth grade, 10.2% had pursued through sixth grade, and 18.6% had completed fourth grade. While most of the participants had had no previous adult education, 72.5%, some had had more than six months, 7.5%. The remainder of the students had had some but less than six months, 20%.

These characteristics are summarized in Tables 1, 2, and 3. In spite of incomplete information for the items of age, type of work, income, and number of dependents, dominance of certain characteristics among those who did respond to these items of the personal data questionnaire make it possible to develop a profile of the adult basic education student in this program:

He was between 40 and 50 years old, just as likely to be male as female, unmarried, living on a farm, and likely to be unemployed although claiming to be a farmer. The participant was typically earning under $500 a year and had an average of 5 dependents. He was most likely to have had no previous adult education although childhood education had been pursued only through the fourth grade.

Teacher Characteristics

The twelve teachers who were included in the final population sample ranged in age from 21 to 62 years. Five were under 30, eight, 66.7%, were 40 or younger, and four were over 40 years. Eight were women and four men. Eight were married, one divorced, and three single. Two listed their home locations as farms, four, as rural non-farm, and six, as urban.

TABLE 1

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS: PERSONAL AND FAMILY

Characteristic		Number	Per Cent
Age			
30 years or under		13	10.8
31 to 40		29	24.2
41 to 50		61	50.8
50 years or over		8	6.7
No response		9	7.5
	Total	120	100.0
Sex			
Male		52	43.3
Female		68	56.7
	Total	120	100.0
Marital Status			
Married		41	34.2
Divorced		5	4.2
Separated		30	25.0
Widowed		19	15.8
Single		22	18.3
No response		3	2.5
	Total	120	100.0
Number of Dependents			
1 to 5		55	45.8
5 to 10		44	36.7
More than 10		11	9.2
No response		10	8.3
	Total	120	100.0

TABLE 2

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS: DOMESTIC AND ECONOMIC

Characteristic		Number	Per Cent
Home Location			
Rural farm		76	63.3
Rural non-farm		38	31.8
Urban		5	4.1
No response		1	0.8
	Total	120	100.0
Employment			
Full-time		6	5.0
Part-time		52	43.3
Unemployed		62	51.7
	Total	120	100.0
Type of Work			
Domestic		7	5.8
Manual labor		4	3.3
Farming		49	40.9
Service or other		6	5.0
No response		54	45.0
	Total	120	100.0
Annual Income			
Under $500		72	60.0
$500 to $1000		31	25.8
$1000 to $3000		10	8.4
No response		7	5.8
	Total	120	100.0

TABLE 3

STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS: EDUCATIONAL

Characteristic		Number	Per Cent
Years of School Previously Completed			
One		8	6.7
Two		18	15.0
Three		20	16.6
Four		22	18.3
Five		24	20.0
Six		12	10.0
Seven		8	6.7
Eight		4	3.3
Nine		2	1.7
No response		2	1.7
	Total	120	100.0
Previous Adult Education			
None		87	72.5
Up to six months		24	20.0
Six months or more		9	7.5
	Total	120	100.0

Six of the teachers had had two years of college, two had completed three years, and four teachers had had four years of college education. Five of the eleven teachers responding to the question pertaining to certification to teach did hold teacher certificates. Six indicated that they did not. Of the several fields of study indicated, five of the teachers noted training in education, two in language arts, one in health, and one in industrial arts. Half the teachers had not taught adults before participation in this program and half indicated previous experience in teaching adults. Those with this experience had taught adults in adult basic education classes. However, only two of the teachers noted that they had had training for adult education other than the in-service training sessions related to the ABE project in which they were then involved.

These characteristics are summarized in Table 4.

Student Achievement

The Adult Basic Learning Examination (ABLE), published by Harcourt, Brace and World, was used as the testing instrument to provide grade scores in vocabulary, reading, spelling, and arithmetic at the beginning and conclusion of the seven month adult education period. Conversion of raw test scores to grade levels required adjustment for students who fell below grade 1.0 or above grade 6.0 on the Level I forms of the test, and for students who fell below 3.0 or above grade 9.0 on the Level II forms of the test. Since the instrument was not designed to distinguish these ranges, an arbitrary assignment of grades 0.9 and 2.9 was made for students who fell below the lower ranges, and grades 6.1 and 9.1 were given to students scoring above the respective ranges for the two levels of the instrument. The four sub-scores were then averaged for over-all grade level scores for the students.

TABLE 4

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF TEACHERS

Characteristic		Number	Per Cent
Age			
Under 30		5	41.6
31 to 40		3	25.0
41 to 50		2	16.7
50 or over		2	16.7
	Total	12	100.0
Sex			
Male		4	33.3
Female		8	66.7
	Total	12	100.0
Marital Status			
Married		8	66.7
Divorced		1	8.3
Single		3	25.0
	Total	12	100.0
Home Location			
Rural farm		2	16.7
Rural non-farm		4	33.3
Urban		6	50.0
	Total	12	100.0
Years of Education			
14 years (2 years of college)		6	50.0
15 years (3 years of college)		2	16.7
16 years (4 years of college)		4	33.3
	Total	12	100.0

TABLE 4 (continued)

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF TEACHERS

Characteristic		Number	Per Cent
Certification			
Yes		4	33.4
No		7	58.3
No response		1	8.3
	Total	12	100.0
Field of Training			
Education		5	41.7
Language Arts		2	16.7
Health		3	25.0
Industrial Arts		1	8.3
No response		1	8.3
	Total	12	100.0
Prior Adult Education			
None		10	83.4
6 to 12 months		1	8.3
Over 1 year		1	8.3
	Total	12	100.0

The adult learning test administered to students at the beginning of the adult basic education program produced a range of grade levels from grade 0 to .9 to grade 8.0 to 8.9. Almost half the students, 45%, were operating at fourth grade level or above. As Table 5 demonstrates, 59.3% of the students had previously completed fourth grade, generally coinciding in distribution among grades with the distribution of students on the first ABLE test. This would indicate that most students still were performing at levels reached in earlier childhood education. The mean grade level for prior education was 4.15. The mean grade level at the time of the first test in the adult basic education program was 4.37.

At the time of the final grade level test within the adult basic education program, student achievement covered the same range of grade 0 to .9 to grade 8.0 to 8.9. However, as Table 6 shows, a greater number were performing at fourth grade or above, 68.4%. The median grade level at this time was 4.64, an over-all gain of .27.

Change in grade scores for individual students was both negative and positive, ranging from minus 3.8 to plus 4.4. Only one student remained unchanged. The distribution of these changes is shown in Table 7, in which it is seen that 20.8% of the students gained more than one grade, 41.7% of the students were within the range of no change to a positive change up to one grade, and 37.5% showed a negative change.

The limited achievement of the student sample as a whole and the large number of students showing negative grade change could not be explained on the basis of data collected except, possibly, in terms of inaccurate administration of tests. However, the twelve classes as groups showed sufficient differences in directions and degrees of change (see Table 8) to warrant an analysis

TABLE 5

STUDENT GRADE LEVELS: FIRST ABLE TEST AND PRIOR EDUCATION

	Pretest			Prior Level of Education		
Grade	Number	Per Cent		Number	Per Cent	
0 to 0.9	4	3.3				
1.0 to 1.9	7	5.9		8	6.7	
2.0 to 2.9	15	12.5		18	15.0	
3.0 to 3.9	21	17.5		20	16.7	
4.0 to 4.9	25	20.8	60.8% fourth grade or over	22	18.2	59.9% fourth grade or over
5.0 to 5.9	29	24.2		24	20.0	
6.0 to 6.9	10	8.3		12	10.0	
7.0 to 7.9	5	4.2		8	6.7	
8.0 to 8.9	4	3.3		4	3.3	
Over 9.0				2	1.7	
No response				2	1.7	
Total	120	100.0		120	100.0	

TABLE 6

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT BY GRADE RANGE

	Pretest (First ABLE Test)			Posttest (Second ABLE Test)		
Grade	Number	Per Cent		Number	Per Cent	
0 to 0.9	4	3.3		1	.8	
1.0 to 1.9	7	5.9		9	7.5	
2.0 to 2.9	15	12.5		17	14.2	
3.0 to 3.9	21	17.5		11	9.1	
4.0 to 4.9	25	20.8	60.8% fourth grade or over	26	21.7	68.4% fourth grade or over
5.0 to 5.9	29	24.2		23	19.2	
6.0 to 6.9	10	8.3		23	19.2	
7.0 to 7.9	5	4.2		6	5.0	
8.0 to 8.9	4	3.3		4	3.3	
Total	120	100.0		120	100.0	

TABLE 7

STUDENT GRADE CHANGE

Direction and Degree of Change	Number		Per Cent	
-4.0 to -3.1	1		0.8	
-3.0 to -2.1	3		2.5	
-2.0 to -1.6	4	45	3.3	37.5
-1.5 to -1.1	6		5.0	
-1.0 to -.6	12		10.0	
-.5 to 0	19		15.9	
0.1 to +.5	28	50	23.4	41.7
+.6 to +1.0	22		18.3	
+1.1 to +1.5	10		8.3	
+1.6 to 2.0	8	25	6.7	20.8
+2.1 to 3.0	3		2.5	
+3.1 to 4.0	3		2.5	
+4.1 to 5.0	1		0.8	
	120		100.0	

TABLE 8

STUDENT GRADE CHANGE BY CLASS

Class	Number of Students	Test I Mean	Test II Mean	Change Mean
1	11	4.6364	5.3182	+.7000
2	11	3.2364	3.9818	+.7455
3	12	5.9333	5.4000	-.5333
4	9	4.9000	5.0889	+.1889
5	6	3.4667	2.2500	-1.2167
6	6	3.1000	3.9167	+.8167
7	5	5.2200	5.4600	+.2400
8	13	4.1769	4.9692	+.7923
9	15	5.2333	5.4267	+.1933
10	9	4.8444	5.1222	+.2778
11	12	3.6500	3.5000	-.1500
12	11	3.3818	4.2091	+.8273
Total	120			

of both student and teacher characteristics for relationships to student achievement.

Scoring the Questionnaire

The Attitude-Problem Questionnaire administered to students and teachers in this adult basic education program was designed around stereotyped judgments of lower socio-economic and middle-class values, attitudes, and problems. Responses were weighted and tabulated for each part of the questionnaire according to their conformity with these stereotypes as originally formulated on the basis of the literature and as upheld in pretests of the questionnaire.

The Test of Attitudes and Values

For Part I, the test of attitude and values, fourteen of the twenty items were judged to represent lower socio-economic perspectives and these items were weighted from four points to one in order, from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The remaining six items were considered representative of middle-class attitudes and values and were weighted in reverse order from one point to four, from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Total scores for Part I were obtained through this procedure by adding the weights for each item. Where responses were omitted, the mean score for that section of the questionnaire was figured and this was used as the response weight for the missing item or items.

The maximum score possible for Part I of the questionnaire was eighty points, indicating the strongest tendency toward middle-class values and attitudes since the respondent, to achieve such a score would have had to strongly disagree with all lower-class items (fourteen weighted at four points each) and strongly agree with all middle-class items (six weighted at four points each). The lowest score possible on Part I of the questionnaire was twenty points, indicating what might be considered extreme lower-class tendency. To achieve this score the respondent would have had to strongly agree with all fourteen lower-class items (fourteen weighted at one point each) and strongly disagree with all middle-class items (six weighted at one point each).

Within these extremes, distinctions of four socio-economic class groups were made for the purpose of grouping the population sample: lower, middle, upper-lower, and lower-middle class. These groups were based upon the division of the possible score range for this part of the questionnaire into four equal sections designated as follows:

Lower class	2 to 35 points
Upper lower-class	36 to 50 points
Lower middle-class	51 to 65 points
Middle-class	66 to 80 points

Table 9 indicates the distribution of scores for the total student population and the twelve teachers. No student score was less than 40 and none higher than 59, the mean being 49.2. This would indicate that the students in this adult basic education program did not evidence to a strong degree the attitudes and values generally attributed to their socio-economic level.

The range of teacher scores on Part I of the questionnaire was far more narrow, the lowest being 51 and the highest 66, with a mean of 56. This placed all teachers in the lower middle to middle-class groups which was the expectation.

The Test of Perception of Problems

For Part II of the questionnaire all twenty items were considered representative of major problems of the lower socio-economic group taking part in an adult basic education project. However, some of the items were not applicable to all students.

In scoring this section of the questionnaire, items were weighted from three points to one in order from "Big Problem" to "No Problem" and these were totalled. Where responses were omitted, the same procedure was followed as far Part I, that is, the mean score was figured and this was used as the response weight for the missing item or items.

The maximum total score for this portion of the questionnaire, sixty points, was considered to represent the greatest number of lower socio-economic class problems. The lowest possible score was 20 points,

TABLE 9

PART I SCORES ON ATTITUDE-PROBLEM QUESTIONNAIRE: STUDENTS & TEACHERS

	Students		Teachers	
Range	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
2 to 35 points	0	0	0	0
36 to 50 points	74	61.7	0	0
51 to 65 points	46	38.3	11	91.7
66 to 80 points	0	0	1	8.3
Total	120	100.0	12	100.0

indicating that none of the sterotyped problems of the lower-class existed. For the purpose of analysis, a division into three groups was made for scores on Part II as follows:

Middle-class	20 to 33 points
Upper lower-class	34 to 47 points
Lower-class	48 to 60 points

The lowest of these three ranges was taken to indicate an absence of problems, an unwillingness to admit them, or an absence of awareness of them. The middle group was considered to have many problems attributed to the disadvantaged adult but not to the degree generalized, and the third group was considered to fit the stereotype in terms of having a great many lower-class problems.

Student scores for Part II of the questionnaire ranged from 27 to 59, with the mean falling at 45.3. Only

7.5% of the students scored 33 or less, indicating that most students were aware of having problems; 61.7% scored 47 or less, 54.2% of them between 34 and 47 points, leaving 38.2% in the group between 48 and 60 points.

Teachers scores ranged from 35 to 57 with a mean of 46. These scores, it is to be remembered, indicate teachers' assessments of problems of adult basic education students rather than their own: 53.8% fell into the middle group and 46.2% into the group recognizing the greatest number of lower-class problems among their students. An examination of Table 10, showing the distribution of scores for both students and teachers on Part II, indicates that five of the teachers were aware of the typical problems of disadvantaged adult students. Of these five teachers, only two had taught adults and adult basic education classes previously. None had prior adult education training. No other characteristics, such as years or fields of education, place of residence, sex, or age, distinguished these five teachers from the others. Although the classes taught by these teachers all showed positive grade gain, there was no significant relationship evidenced between teacher perception of student problems and class gain. Classes with teachers showing the minimum awareness of student problems achieved as well as others (see Table 11).

TABLE 10

PART II SCORES ON ATTITUDE-PROBLEM QUESTIONNAIRE: STUDENTS & TEACHERS

Range	Students		Teachers	
	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
20 to 33 points	9	7.5	0	0
34 to 47 points	65	54.2	7	58.3
48 to 60 points	46	38.3	5	41.7
Total	120	100.0	12	100.0

TABLE 11

CLASS GRADE LEVEL CHANGE COMPARED WITH TEACHER SCORES ON ATTITUDE-PROBLEM QUESTIONNAIRE: PART II

Class	Mean Grade Change	Teacher Score on Questionnaire: Part II*
1**	+.7000	57
2	+.7455	54
3	-.5333	40
4	+.1889	41
5**	-1.2167	43
6	+.8167	35
7	+.2400	45
8**	+.7923	35
9	+.1933	54
10	+.2778	53
11	-.1500	38
12	+.8273	53

*Scores of 48 to 60 indicated that teachers attributed most stereotyped lower socio-economic class problems to adult basic education students

**Class which had changes in teachers during the adult basic education program

Testing of the Hypotheses

It was hypothesized that students in adult basic education programs do not differ from their teachers in certain noncognitive variables, specifically in values, attitudes, and perceptions of students' problems. To test this hypothesis the total student and teacher samples were studied in relation to Part I and Part II of the Attitude-Problem Questionnaire. For each part, the mean score for teachers was derived as well as the standard deviation for student scores. Students were then categorized into three groups: those within one standard deviation around the mean score for teachers, those below this score and those above it. Table 12 demonstrates the results of this analysis.

For Part I of the questionnaire, the test of values and attitudes, 105 of the students fell into the group below the teacher level (Group A), 14 students scored at the same level as the teachers (Group B), and one student scored above the teacher level (Group C). One hundred six, or 88.3% of the students, then, differed from their teachers in values and attitudes, 87.5% being below the teachers and 0.8% above. Only 11.7% fell into the same group as did the teachers. It can be said, therefore, that this portion of the hypothesis was rejected. Adult basic education students in this program were found to differ to a significant degree from their teachers in values and attitudes.

The student sample was more evenly divided among the three groups on Part II of the questionnaire, the test of perception of students' problems. Thirty-one students fell into the group indicating more lower-class problems than indicated by the teachers' perceptions (Group C), 52 scored at the same level as did the teachers (Group B), and 37 perceived fewer problems than did the teachers (Group A). For this part of the questionnaire, then, sixty-eight or 57.7% of the students differed from their teachers in perceptions of their problems. However, only 25.8% indicated that they had more lower-class problems than teachers perceived, which was the expectation in stating the hypothesis.

It can be concluded, therefore, that while students did not differ from their teachers to a significant extent in having more lower-class problems than the teachers perceived, a significant number of students did differ from their teachers. The first hypothesis, then, as stated, was rejected by responses to this portion of the questionnaire.

The second hypothesis stated that if differences exist between the values, attitudes, and perceptions of students' problems on the part of the teacher and of the student himself, they have no direct relationship to achievement on the part of the student. To test this hypothesis each class was analyzed in relation to its own teacher. The three classes which had had changes in teachers during the adult education program were included to determine whether they differed significantly from the other groups.

Each class was divided into three groups based upon scores for Part I of the questionnaire. Those who scored within one standard deviation, based upon total student scores, around the score of the teacher of that class were considered the same as the teacher in values and attitudes. They were classified as Group B. Those students who scored below this level made up Group A, and those above it formed Group C. Groups A and C were considered different from the teacher.

Since teacher scores for Part I of the questionnaire ranged from 51 to 66 points, student groups around the teachers differed in score ranges for each class. Table 13 shows the groupings for individual classes. It will be noted that the three classes in which teachers were changed show no difference in distribution from the others.

The same procedure was followed in grouping students in each class around their teachers for Part II of the questionnaire. This distribution is shown in Table 14.

To determine the relationship of difference in values and attitudes between the teacher and his students

TABLE 12

STUDENT GROUPING ON THE ATTITUDE-PROBLEM QUESTIONNAIRE

	Number		Per Cent	
Part I:				
Teacher mean: 56				
Standard deviation for students: 4				
Group A	105		87.5	
Group C	1	106	0.8	88.3
Group B	14	14	11.7	11.7
Total		120		100.0
Part II:				
Teacher mean: 46				
Standard deviation for students: 8				
Group A	37		30.9	
Group C	31	68	25.8	56.7
Group B	52	52	43.4	43.3
Total		120		100.0

to student achievement, a multiple analysis t-test was employed. Of the twelve classes in the sample, only seven were of suitable size and composition for this analysis of responses to Part I of the questionnaire. Mean grade level change for three of the seven classes was higher for students in Group B, the group most like the teacher, than for Groups A and B combined. Two of these classes were those in which teachers had been changed. In only one was the relationship between achievement and similarity to the teacher in values and attitudes found to exist to the statistically significant level of .05. This class, however, had only two students in Group B. In the remaining four classes, Group B students showed a lesser or a negative mean grade change, but none of these relationships demonstrated statistical significance.

The t-test analysis was used also to determine the relationship to student achievement of differences between students' perceptions of their problems and their teachers' perceptions of them. Eleven of the twelve classes could be tested for Part II of the questionnaire if Groups A and C were combined. Only two classes could be analyzed by this means when Groups A and C were considered separately.

Of the eleven classes, eight demonstrated a greater mean grade gain for Group B students than for Group A and C

TABLE 13

STUDENT GROUPING BY CLASS ON ATTITUDE-PROBLEM QUESTIONNAIRE: PART I

Class	Number of Students	Teacher Score	Number of Students Same as Teacher (Group B)	Number of Students Different From Teacher (A & C)	Per Cent Same as Teacher	Per Cent Different From Teacher
1	11	52	2*	9	18.2	81.8
2	11	55	2	9	18.2	81.8
3	12	61	0	12	0	100.0
4	9	66	0	9	0	100.0
5	6	56	1	5	16.7	83.3
6	6	58	0	6	0	100.0
7	5	53	2	3	40.0	60.0
8	13	57	2	11	15.4	84.6
9	15	57	0	15	0	100.0
10	9	51	6	3	66.7	33.3
11	12	56	3	9	25.0	75.0
12	11	51	3	8	27.3	72.7

* Relationship between achievement and similarity to teacher significant at .05 level

TABLE 14

STUDENT GROUPING BY CLASS ON ATTITUDE-PROBLEM QUESTIONNAIRE: PART II

Class	Number of Students	Teacher Score	Number of Students Same as Teacher (Group B)	Number of Students Different From Teacher (A & C)	Per Cent Same as Teacher	Per Cent Different From Teacher
1	11	57	3	8	27.3	72.7
2	11	54	3	8	27.3	72.7
3	12	40	2	10	16.7	83.3
4	9	41	7	2	77.7	22.3
5	6	43	4	2	66.6	33.4
6	6	35	1	5	16.7	83.3
7	5	45	3	2	60.0	40.0
8	13	35	4	9	30.8	69.2
9	15	54	7*	8	46.7	53.3
10	9	53	2	7	22.3	77.7
11	12	38	3	9	25.0	75.0
12	11	53	4	7	36.4	63.6

* Relationship between achievement and similarity to teacher significant at .05 level

students combined. In only one class, however, was the difference between the two groups found to be significant at an .05 level.

The eight classes in which Group B students showed greater achievement included two in which there had been changes in teachers during the adult basic education program.

It is evident that, on the basis of analysis of individual classes, the hypothesis stating that if differences exist between the values, attitudes, and perceptions of students' problems on the part of the teacher and of the student himself, they have no direct relationship to achievement on the part of the student was supported. It is to be noted, however, that of the total eighteen t-test analyses by classes that could be performed for both parts of the questionnaire, eleven classes demonstrated a greater mean grade gain for Group B students, those most like the teacher. This would indicate that, while a relationship between student and teacher values, attitudes, and perceptions of students' problems to student achievement could not be statistically verified, a definite trend toward such a relationship was demonstrated. Lack of statistical support, it was felt, was due to the small class sizes and distribution of students within the classes.

To eliminate restrictions imposed by class size upon the analysis, the t-test was applied to the total student sample grouped around the mean score for teachers. On this analysis for Part I of the questionnaire Group B showed a smaller mean grade level change than students in Groups A and C combined. The latter group's difference from Group B in achievement was not statistically significant, however.

For Part II of the questionnaire, Group B again showed the smaller achievement mean when all students were considered but, again, the difference between groups was not statistically significant. When the three groups were studied separately for their response to this portion of the questionnaire, there being a sufficient number of students in each group to do so, Group A students, who claimed the fewest lower-class problems, showed the greatest mean grade gain (.43). Group C students, claiming the greatest number of problems, ranked second (.27), and Group B students lowest (.17). No comparison between groups was found to be statistically significant.

The relationship of group identification to achievement for the total student sample on Part I and Part II of the Attitude-Problem Questionnaire may be seen in distribution Tables 15 and 16.

Reversal of the trend for Group B students to show greater achievement when the sample was taken as a whole may be attributed to the small number of students falling into this group on Part I of the questionnaire, and to the wide range of responses for teachers on Part II of the questionnaire. The latter resulted in the classification of students in many of the larger classes around a teacher mean that was considerably higher or lower than the score for teachers of these classes when taken individually. Further study is needed, however, to verify such possible explanations.

TABLE 15

RELATIONSHIP OF STUDENT VALUES AND ATTITUDES TO ACHIEVEMENT

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	STUDENT CLASSIFICATION AROUND TEACHER MEAN (56)		
	Group C (more middle-class)	Group B (same as teacher)	Group A (more lower-class)
High +1.0 or more	1	3	24
Medium +0 to +0.9		4	45
Low negative change		7	36
Total	1	14	105

TABLE 16

RELATIONSHIP OF STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF PROBLEMS TO ACHIEVEMENT

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT	STUDENT CLASSIFICATION AROUND TEACHER MEAN (46)		
	Group C (more lower-class)	Group B (same as teacher)	Group A (more middle-class)
High +1.0 or more	8	9	11
Medium +0 to +0.9	14	22	12
Low Negative change	9	21	14
Total	31	52	37

CHAPTER V

RECAPITULATION AND DISCUSSION

Summary

The present study was undertaken to provide empirical data concerning factors contributing to achievement among adult basic education students. Of primary concern was the effect of the student-teacher relationship as determined by differences between the two groups in noncognitive attributes, particularly values, attitudes, and perceptions of student problems.

The study was based upon two general objectives. The first was a comparison of values, attitudes, and perceptions of student problems in several areas of life of teachers and students in an adult basic education program. The second was the determination of the relationship of similarities or differences between teachers and students to achievement on the part of students.

With these objectives as a basis for the study, two hypotheses were formulated:

1. Students in adult basic education programs do not differ from their teachers in such noncognitive variables as values, attitudes, and perceptions of students' problems.

2. If differences exist between the values, attitudes, and perceptions of students' problems on the part of the teacher and of the student himself, they have no direct relationship to achievement on the part of the student.

Procedures

A sample population of 120 students and 12 teachers taking part in a selected adult basic education program in the Mississippi Delta region was used to test the hypotheses.

Achievement among students in this group was measured by grade level scores attained in pretests and posttests utilizing the Adult Basic Learning Examination of Karlsen, Madden, and Gardner (ABLE). To test values, attitudes, and perceptions of student problems on the part of both students and teachers in this adult basic education program, the Attitude-Problem Questionnaire was developed. This instrument was administered to students and teachers during the period between the two achievement tests. Personal data on students and teachers also was obtained.

Findings

The data revealed that adult basic education students do differ from their teachers in values, attitudes, and perceptions of students' problems, therefore, the first hypothesis was rejected. In values and attitudes the teachers in the sample group were found to be lower middle to middle-class. Of the students, 87.5% were more lower-class than their teachers, 0.8% were more middle-class, and 11.7% were the same. However, none of the students responded in conformity with the stereotyped values and attitudes of the disadvantaged lower-class.

Teachers were found to be less alike in their assessment of students' problems than they were in their own attitudes and values. Following this pattern, students were more evenly distributed in relation to teachers in their indications of their own problems: 25.8% felt they had more lower-class problems than their teachers did, 30.8% indicated they had fewer problems than the teachers expected them to have, and 43.4% generally agreed with their teachers in their perceptions of problems of disadvantaged adults.

An analysis of individual classes indicated that a direct relationship of differences between students and teachers in values, attitudes, and perceptions of students' problems to achievement on the part of the students could not be statistically verified and, therefore, the second hypothesis was supported. No significant relationship could be found between the achievement of students and similarity or dissimilarity to their teachers in values and attitudes or perceptions of problems.

Small class size and distribution of students within classes limited the value of this analysis, however. The limited range of student achievement for the sample as a whole (.27), and the wide variation in individual grade level change, from minus 3.8 to plus 4.4, also limited analysis of the data in terms of the hypotheses. Since the data were collected by practitioners in the adult basic education program, it is possible that the Adult Basic Learning Examination was not administered with a high degree of accuracy. Secondly, fear of elimination from the program upon attainment of higher grade levels may have influenced some students' motivation to score as high as possible on these tests. A third possible explanation for findings in terms of achievement lies in the testing instrument itself and its inability to measure small increments in achievement.

Discussion

This study reinforced with empirical data the belief that lower socio-economic adult students differ from their more middle-class teachers in values and attitudes. In the sample studied, however, students all fell between the upper lower-class and the lower middle-class rather than being characterized by lower-class values and attitudes attributed to them in the literature. This may have been due to one of several factors or a combination of factors which warrant further research.

Students in this sample had been participating in the adult basic education program for approximately five months at the time the Attitude-Problem Questionnaire was administered. It is possible, therefore, that their attitudes and values were altered by the education program. It is recommended that this instrument, or others that may be developed to study these noncognitive variables, be administered to students at the outset and conclusion of adult basic education programs to determine the effect of such participation on their values and attitudes.

Since this study did not provide data indicating a change in values and attitudes as a result of adult education participation, other possible explanations for responses that did not conform to the lower socio-economic class stereotype among this sample group must be sought. One such possibility is that the population sample, representative of a group generally alienated from the dominant white majority culture, gave answers it felt were expected rather than those that represented their actual beliefs. To do this, they would have had to be aware of the expected answers. Such an awareness might have been provided by the ABE program or existed prior to it. Lewis has stated that among the poor "there is an awareness of middle-class values . . . people talk about them and even claim some of them as their own."[1] When exposure to the mass media and the field work of organizations promoting civil rights are considered, such awareness seems possible even among a rural and relatively isolated population sample.

Whether student responses represent their actual values and attitudes or those expected, then, becomes another aspect of study of noncognitive factors in adult basic education that requires further, controlled, investigation.

This also raises the question of whether actual values and attitudes are those claimed or those practiced. Lewis points out, in writing further of awareness of middle-class values on the part of the poor, that "on the whole . . . they do not live by them."[2] For the purpose of the present study it may be assumed that an awareness of middle-class values and attitudes and a claim to them represent, in some measure, a level of aspiration. On this basis, the responses of students to the Attitude-Problem Questionnaire may be considered truthful to the same extent that responses of the middle-class teacher sample are considered representative although research has provided evidence that practice does not always follow avowed values for the latter socio-economic group.

---

[1] Lewis, op. cit., p. 23.

[2] Ibid.

Such an assumption leads to questioning of the stereotype of the disadvantaged adult as he has been described. While characterizations found in the literature may have been accurate at the time the War on Poverty was begun under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, it is possible that events of the ensuing years have altered values and attitudes among members of the lower socio-economic class, even in isolated, rural areas of the country, and may have contributed to an altered self-concept and level of aspiration among this segment of the population along with an increased awareness of middle-class values and attitudes. It is evident that further research is needed to determine whether such changes have taken place.

Closely related to this is the perception of problems of adult basic education students on the part of both students and teachers. It may be assumed that students were unaware of or unwilling to admit having problems usually attributed to their socio-economic group since the personal data compiled indicated that such problems were likely to exist. On the other hand, the indication of limited awareness of these problems on the part of the teachers, all of whom were natives of Mississippi and, one can assume, an environment similar to that of the students, raises questions as to the changes that education has brought about in them as well as to their motivation to teach adult basic education classes.

Returning to the description by Pearce[1] of the ideal teacher of adult basic education students cited earlier, we find evidence that exposure to conditions similar to those under which the students live may be much more important than prior educational experience to success in the adult basic education setting. The present study would indicate, however, that the existence of such conditions may be denied by teachers who have risen to a middle-class status, in spite of early exposure to them and an in-service training program designed to help teachers deal with such problems. This might be considered a manifestation of lack of acceptance of students on the part of teachers and indicate teacher participation in the ABE program based upon motivations that could contribute negatively to the student-teacher relationship and to achievement on the part of the students. Here, again, further investigation is needed.

Although no relationship was established between teacher perception of student problems and student achievement, it is to be pointed out that achievement, in this study, was assessed only on the basis of grade level change in vocabulary, reading, spelling, and arithmetic as determined by the Adult Basic Learning Examination. No evaluation was made of student progress in such areas as oral communication, citizenship, family and community living, which have been considered essential aspects of basic education for adults. A more thorough study of student achievement which includes these areas might substantiate a more significant influence of the student-teacher relationship on student progress.

---

[1] See pp. 21-22, *supra*.

It is recommended that such study be based upon more careful testing of students than was evidenced in the test data provided on this population sample, and upon research methods utilizing groups controlled in size, composition, and teacher characteristics. Such study should be conducted over a sufficient period of time to provide dependable assessments of student change.

APPENDIX

THE ATTITUDE-PROBLEM QUESTIONNAIRE

Teachers: We are asking you to cooperate in a research project that may help to develop better adult basic education programs. We hope that you will not consider this task an imposition, but rather a contribution to the understanding of teaching and learning in adult basic education.

There are no correct or incorrect answers. The important thing is that you express your true feelings as frankly as possible. Your responses will be known only to the researchers at Florida State University and your identity will remain anonymous.

You will note that all the statements listed on the following pages are the same for you and your students. The directions indicating how you are to respond to the statements are not the same as those given to the students, however. Please read all directions carefully before answering each section.

FOR TEACHERS

PERSONAL DATA: TEACHER AND TEACHER AIDES

1. Check one: _____Teacher _____Teacher Aide

2. Name of Center________________________County_________

3. Number of students in your class__________

4. Date of Birth____________________________

5. Place of Birth___________________________

6. Sex: Male_______ Female_________

7. Marital Status: Married______Divorced_____Separated____
   Single______Widowed_____

8. Present Home Location: Rural Farm____ Rural non-Farm___
   Urban_____

9. Education: Teacher's Certificate--Yes____ No____

   Field_____________________________

   Highest Degree Completed_____________

   High School_______(number of years)

   College_____(number of years)

10. Have you ever taught adults before?_______

11. Have you ever taught adult basic education classes before?_________

12. Other than the regular in-service training sessions connected with this year's ABE project, have you had any special training for adult education? Yes_____ No_____

13. If yes, briefly describe this training_______________

    ____

    ____

    ____

14. Please turn this page over and list the names of your Adult Basic Education students.

PART I

Below are some statements on which we would like to know your feelings. Please give your own opinion about each statement by circling the term which most nearly tells how you feel about the statement.

1. The Lord will provide for us.

Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

2. Education should teach a person to think, not just to do a job.

Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

3. Women have the children and it's their job to raise them.

Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

4. Most people would rather have TV sets in their houses than bathtubs.

Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

5. When we go to Heaven we won't have to suffer any more.

Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

6. Education doesn't really help you get along in this world.

Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

7. There's no use in fixing up our houses.

Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

8. Neat and clean clothes show that a person's honest and responsible.

Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

9. Our kinfolk are all that we have.

Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

10. Grown-ups should go to school for a while and if it doesn't help them they should quit.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

---

11. So what if a fellow buys a bottle in the evening, he's got to forget his troubles.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

---

12. We live here but this town doesn't belong to us.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

---

13. The best kind of job is working at a desk in an air conditioned office.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

---

14. The police work to protect us.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

---

15. God gives people all the children they should have.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

---

16. White people don't really want to help Negroes, they just want to keep them quiet.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

---

17. There's no use thinking about next year or the years after, just today.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

---

18. Violence is cowardly and useless.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

---

19. There's no use working all day when you can't earn enough to feed your family.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

---

20. If we try hard we can make better lives for ourselves.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

PART II

Below are some statements about problems that adult basic education students may have. For each statement please indicate whether you think most adult basic education students find it to be a big problem, a little problem, or no problem by drawing a circle around the words which most clearly reflect your opinion.

Please try not to think of any particular group of students or individual but of ABE students in general. Note that we would like your opinion of students' problems, not of your own problems.

1. Our house is too crowded.

   Big Problem Little Problem No Problem

---

2. I worry because if I get sick I won't be able to work.

   Big Problem Little Problem No Problem

---

3. I need to learn to spend my money in better ways.

   Big Problem Little Problem No Problem

---

4. I don't feel very important.

   Big Problem Little Problem No Problem

---

5. I'm afraid to try new things.

   Big Problem Little Problem No Problem

---

6. I don't understand my children.

   Big Problem Little Problem No Problem

---

7. I need to learn to stay healthier.

   Big Problem Little Problem No Problem

---

8. I can't do work that pays enough to take care of my family.

   Big Problem Little Problem No Problem

---

9. I can't remember the things I learn in school.

   Big Problem Little Problem No Problem

---

10. The things I learn in school don't help me find a better job.

Big Problem Little Problem No Problem.

11. I have to work too hard at home.

Big Problem Little Problem No Problem

12. I need a place to be by myself sometimes.

Big Problem Little Problem No Problem

13. I can't help my children do better in school.

Big Problem Little Problem No Problem

14. I don't know how to plan for the future.

Big Problem Little Problem No Problem

15. Most people have too many children to take care of.

Big Problem Little Problem No Problem

16. I have to keep working even when I don't feel well.

Big Problem Little Problem No Problem

17. I can't get a promotion even though I deserve one.

Big Problem Little Problem No Problem

18. I need to learn to stick up for my rights.

Big Problem Little Problem No Problem

19. I always feel tired.

Big Problem Little Problem No Problem

20. I need to talk to someone about my problems.

Big Problem Little Problem No Problem

FOR STUDENTS

PERSONAL DATA: STUDENTS

1. Name____
2. Name of Center______________________________
3. County______________________________________
4. Name of Teacher_____________________________
5. Name of Teacher Aide_________________________
6. Date of Birth_______________________________
7. Place of Birth______________________________
8. Sex: Male_____ Female_____
9. Marital Status: Married____ Divorced____ Separated____
   Single____ Widowed____
10. Present home location: Rural Farm____ Rural non-Farm____
    Urban____
11. Are you employed: Yes_____ No_____
12. Are you employed part time: Yes____ No____
13. If yes, give name of work____________________________
14. Income: $___________ a year.
15. Number of dependents_______.
16. Highest school grade level reached______________________.
17. Have you ever been in an adult education class before?____
    If yes, where?________________ for how long?______________.

PART I

We are asking you to cooperate in a research project that may help to develop better adult basic education programs. Below are some statements on which we would like to know your feelings. There are no right or wrong answers. Some people agree with them and other people disagree. Below each statement please circle the answer that describes how you feel about it.

1. The Lord will provide for us.

   Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

2. Education should teach a person to think, not just do do a job.

   Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

3. Women have the children and it's their job to raise them.

   Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

4. Most people would rather have TV sets in their homes than bathtubs.

   Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

5. When we go to Heaven we won't have to suffer any more.

   Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

6. Education doesn't really help you get along in this world.

   Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

7. There's no use in fixing up our houses.

   Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

8. Neat and clean clothes show that a person's honest and responsible.

   Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

9. Our kinfolk are all that we have.

   Strongly Agree   Agree   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

10. Grown-ups should go to school for a while and if it doesn't help them they should quit.

    Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

11. So what if a fellow buys a bottle in the evening, he's got to forget his troubles.

    Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

12. We live here but this town doesn't belong to us.

    Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

13. The best kind of job is working at a desk in an air conditioned office.

    Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

14. The police work to protect us.

    Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

15. God gives people all the children they should have.

    Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

16. White people don't really want to help Negroes, they just want to keep them quiet.

    Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

17. There's no use thinking about next year or the years after, just today.

    Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

18. Violence is cowardly and useless.

    Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

19. There's no use working all day when you can't earn enough to feed your family.

    Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

20. If we try hard we can make better lives for ourselves.

    Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

PART II

Below are some statements about problems that some people have. There are none that you should have or shouldn't have, so there are no right or wrong answers. After each statement please circle the answer that best fits you.

1. Our house is too crowded.

Big Problem Little Problem No Problem

---

2. I worry if I get sick I won't be able to work.

Big Problem Little Problem No Problem

---

3. I need to learn to spend my money in better ways.

Big Problem Little Problem No Problem

---

4. I don't feel very important.

Big Problem Little Problem No Problem

---

5. I'm afraid to try new things.

Big Problem Little Problem No Problem

---

6. I don't understand my children.

Big Problem Little Problem No Problem

---

7. I need to learn to stay healthier.

Big Problem Little Problem No Problem

---

8. I can't do work that pays enough to take care of my family.

Big Problem Little Problem No Problem

---

9. I can't remember the things I learn in school.

Big Problem Little Problem No Problem

---

10. The things I learn in school don't help me find a better job.

Big Problem   Little Problem   No Problem

11. I have to work too hard at home.

Big Problem   Little Problem   No Problem

12. I need a place to be by myself sometimes.

Big Problem   Little Problem   No Problem

13. I can't help my children do better in school.

Big Problem   Little Problem   No Problem

14. I don't know how to plan for the future.

Big Problem   Little Problem   No Problem

15. Most people have too many children to take care of.

Big Problem   Little Problem   No Problem

16. I have to keep working even when I don't feel well.

Big Problem   Little Problem   No Problem

17. I can't get a promotion even though I deserve one.

Big Problem   Little Problem   No Problem

18. I need to learn to stick up for my rights.

Big Problem   Little Problem   No Problem

19. I always feel tired.

Big Problem   Little Problem   No Problem

20. I need to talk to someone about my problems.

Big Problem   Little Problem   No Problem.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Allport, Gordon W.; Vernon, Philip E.; and Lindzey, Gardner. *Study of Values: A Scale for Measuring the Dominant Interest in Personality*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1960.

Atkinson, John W., and Feather, Norman T. *A Theory of Achievement Motivation*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.

Brunner, Edmund de S. *An Overview of Adult Education Research*. Chicago: Adult Education Association of the U. S. A., 1959.

Biddle, Bruce J., and Ellena, William J., eds. *Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1964.

Coles, Robert. *The Poor Don't Want To Be Middle-Class*. New York: Curriculum Consultation Service, 103 E. 125th St., 1965.

Cage, N. L., ed. *Handbook of Research on Teaching*. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963.

Heckhausen, Heinz. *The Anatomy of Achievement Motivation*. New York: Academic Press, 1967.

Houle, Cyril O., *The Inquiring Mind*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1963.

Johnstone, John W. C., and Rivera, Ramon J. *Volunteers for Learning*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1965.

Kidd, J. R. *How Adults Learn*. New York: Association Press, 1959.

Killian, Lewis M. *The Impossible Revolution?* New York: Random House, 1968.

Lanning, Frank W., and Many, Wesley A. eds., *Basic Education for the Disadvantaged Adult: Theory and Practice*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1966.

Levine, David, ed., Nebraska Symposium on Motivation. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1967.

McClelland, D. C.; Atkinson, J. W.; Clark R. A.; and Lowell, E. L. The Achievement Motive. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953.

Miller, Harry L. Teaching and Learning in Adult Education. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1964.

National Association for Public School Adult Education. A Guide for Teacher Trainers in Adult Basic Education. Washington, D. C.: NAPSAE, 1966.

Remmers, H. H. Introduction to Opinion and Attitude Measurement. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954.

Ryans, David G. Characteristics of Teachers. Washington, D. C., The American Council on Education, 1960.

Sears, Pauline S., and Sherman, Vivian S. In Pursuit of Self-Esteem. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1964.

Silver, James W. Mississippi: The Closed Society. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1964.

Thurston, L. L. The Measurement of Values. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1959.

Articles

Brazziel, William F. "Correlates of Southern Negro Personality." Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 20 (April, 1964), pp. 46-53.

Dreger, Ralph Mason, and Miller, Kent S. "Comparative Psychological Studies of Negroes and Whites in the United States." Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 70, Part II, Monograph Supplement (September, 1968), pp. 1-58.

Glenn, Norval D. "The Trend in Differences in Attitudes and Behavior by Educational Level." The Sociology of Education, Vol. 39 (Summer, 1966), pp. 255-275.

Glenn, Norval D. and Alston, Jon P. "Rural-Urban Differences in Reported Attitude and Behavior." Southwestern Social Science Quarterly, Vol. 47 (March, 1967), pp. 381-400.

Grindstaff, Carl F. "The Negro, Urbanization and Relative Deprivation in the Deep South." Social Problems, Vol. 15 (Winter, 1968), pp. 342-352.

Kahl, Joseph A. "Some Measurements of Achievement Orientation." The American Journal of Sociology. Vol. 70 (May, 1965), pp. 669-681.

Katz, Irwin, "Some Motivational Determinants of Racial Differences in Intellectual Achievement." International Journal of Psychology. Vol. 2, No. 1 (1967) pp. 1-12.

Kemper, Theodore D. "Reference Groups, Attitude and Achievement." The American Sociological Review, Vol. 33 (February, 1968), pp. 31-45.

Lewis, Oscar. "The Culture of Poverty." Scientific American, Vol. 215 (October, 1966), pp. 19-25.

Pearce, Frank. "Basic Education Teachers: Seven Needed Qualities." Adult Leadership, Vol. 16 (January, 1968), pp. 255-258, 278.

Reissman, Frank. "Lessons of Poverty." American Education (United States Office of Education), Vol. 1 (February, 1965), pp. 21-23.

Rosenfeld, Howard, and Zander, Alvin. "Dimensions of Teacher Attitudes." The Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 52 (February, 1961), pp. 1-11.

Scanzoni, John. "Sociolization, n Achievement, and Achievement Values." The American Sociological Review, Vol. 32 (June, 1967), pp. 449-456.

Public Documents

U. S. Office of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics, Division of Operations Analysis. "Educational Achievement Among Mexican-Americans: A Special Report from the Educational Opportunities Survey," Report No. NCES-TN-22, by George W. Mayeske. Washington, D. C.: Office of Education, 1967. Working paper.

78 U. S. Statutes at Large 508 (1964).

U. S. Welfare Administration. Low Income Life Styles. Ed. by Lola M. Irelan. Washington, D. C.: G.P.O., 1960.

Unpublished Materials

Aker, George F.; Jahns, Irwin R.; and Schroeder, Wayne L. "Evaluation of an Adult Basic Education Program in a Southern Rural Community." Department of Adult Education, Florida State University, 1968.

Allen, Benjamin J., Jr. "The Construction of an Instrument Designed to Measure Student Held Attitudes Toward Certain American Values as Related to a Jury of Experts Consensus." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1965.

Bradford, David Lee. "The Formation of Achievement Attitudes Among Lower-class Negro Youth.". Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1966. (Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 28A, No. 1-3, 1967)

Dutton, Marion D. "A Description and Analysis of Selected Characteristics of Participants in Adult Basic Education in Hillsborough County, Florida." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1967.

Fessler, Donald R. "The Challenge: Motivating the Poor." Unpublished talk delivered November 6, 1965, revised December, 1965).

Florida State University. Frontiers in Adult Basic Education. Tallahassee: Florida State University, Department of Adult Education, 1966.

Hand, S. E., and Puder, William H. "Personality Factors which May Interfere with the Learning of ABE Students." Tallahassee: Florida State University Department of Adult Education, n.d.

Hanna, Lyle, "Teacher Education for Advancing the Culturally Handicapped." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, California State College, 1967.

Howard, Douglas Pierre, "The Relationship Between the Needs and Problems of Socially Disadvantaged Urban Children as Perceived by the Children and by Public School Personnel." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Syracuse University, 1966.

Khan, S. R. "The Contribution of Attitudinal Factors to the Prediction of Academic Achievement in Secondary School." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1966.

Ohio State University. Workshop in Adult Basic Education. Columbus: Ohio State University, College of Education, Center for Adult Education, 1967.

Scharles, Henry G., Jr. "The Relationship of Selected Personality Needs to Participation, Drop Out, and Achievement Among Adult Learners." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1966.

Skeel, Dorothy June, "Determining the Compatibility of Student Teachers for Culturally Deprived Schools by Means of a Cultural Attitude Inventory." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1966. (Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. 27A. No. 10-12, 1967.)

VITA

Majorie Newman (Mrs.)
Place and Date of Birth: New York, N.Y., August 19, 1929

EDUCATION:

Florida State University	- M.S. in Adult Education, 1969
	- additional graduate work in elementary and secondary education, psychology, communications
University of Minnesota	- graduate study in music history and education, 1956-1961
Hunter College	- B.S. in Music History and Broadcasting, 1952

PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND:

WFSU-FM, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida
Station Manager and Program Director, 1958 to date

National Association of Educational Broadcasters
- Member, Board of Directors, January, 1964 - December, 1967
- Conference Coordinator, Southeast Region, 1964-1967

National Educational Radio
- Member, Board of Directors, January, 1969-

Public Broadcasting Corporation
- Member, Radio Advisory Council, 1969-

MEMBERSHIPS:

Adult Education Association of the U.S.A.
Kappa Delta Pi (honor society in education)
DAVI (Department of Audiovisual Instruction, National Education Association)
National Association of Educational Broadcasters

SPECIAL ASSIGNMENTS:

Florida State University Role and Scope Study - Department Chairman (Radio & TV)

National Association of Educational Broadcasters Radio Network Program Committee

U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare - Consultant on rules and regulations to be set up under Public Broadcasting Act, December, 1967

Florida State University Artist Series Committee

ERIC Clearinghouse
JUL 16 1969
on Adult Education